

To: Faust, Matt[mfaust@bristol-companies.com]; Ruth, Scott[sruth@bristol-companies.com]
Cc: Kamke, Sherry[Kamke.Sherry@epa.gov]; KHanson@ldftribe.com[KHanson@ldftribe.com]
From: Egan, Robert
Sent: Mon 8/1/2016 12:52:23 PM
Subject: Comments on work plan

Matt,

Here are my comments on the work plan. Please let me know if you have any questions.

I expect to receive comments from Kristen Hanson. We may be able to discuss them and my comments below if we can arrange a call. I will let you know what I hear back from Kristen on her availability for today. Here are a few additional items for discussion on our call:

- Coleman's schedule for arrival at the site
- Expected process for shipping samples
- Location for the start of well drilling
- The inclusion of a Summary of Detection list in the data package

Work Plan Comments:

Section 2 Scope of Work- In the first paragraph and in Section 3.3.1, there is reference to a short (2-foot) screen to be used for the wells. I missed this specification in the statement of work. All current piezometers at the site have 5 foot long screens. We should discuss this with Kristen Hanson. There is a potential for slow recharge if it they are placed in lower permeability zones. We also want to make sure that we cover the area of most interest with our screens, which may favor the use of 5 foot long screens. The MiHPT graphs should provide some help with this and we can use them in our discussion.

In the last paragraph of Section 2, please include the surveying of the MiHPT locations.

Section 2.2- In the table under Activity for August 3, the word “being” is misspelled.

Section 3.1- All the parameters listed are not COCs for the Tower Standard site. The COCs are the VOCs listed, lead scavengers, lead, cadmium, and GRO/DRO. The others, such as the water quality parameters, are of interest because site contamination may have affected them. Perhaps a general statement that the other metals and water quality parameters are parameters of interest would be more accurate.

Section 3.3.1- the deep well designation- MW16BR may cause confusion in the future if we install a bedrock well in that location. We should discuss other potential designations for this and the medium depth well.

Section 3.3.1, page 10- Why is well development limited to one hour? The goal should be to provide sediment-free water.

Section 3.3.2- In the sixth bullet, there is reference to moving from least to most contaminated wells for the sampling order. This is standard practice, of course, but in this case may necessitate the sampler moving back and forth between the locations and not being able to sample all wells in one location because we expect some or most wells to be highly contaminated. We can discuss this on our call.

Section 5.2- Drop the references to WDNR Enforcement Standards and PALs. Only Tribal and EPA standards/screening level references should be used, such as the Tribal Code, EPA MCLs, and EPA health-based screening levels.

Bob Egan

Corrective Action Manager

Underground Storage Tanks Section

RCRA Branch

EPA Region 5

(312) 886-6212

(312) 692-2911 (fax)